

Attorney Docket No.: B 034372US

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
AUG 02 2006

REMARKS

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Claims 1-10 had been previously canceled. Claims 11, 19, 23 and 27 have been amended. Thus, claims 11-28 remain pending in the present application. No new matter has been added. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable.

**II. THE 35 U.S.C. § 112 REJECTIONS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN**

Claim 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. (See 05/04/06 Office Action, p. 2, lines 18-22). The examiner indicated that “operating the central to compute” of claim 23 is not clear. Claim 23 has been amended to recite, “operating the central station to compute.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection should be withdrawn.

**III. THE 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTIONS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN**

Claims 11-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,920,261 to Hughes et al. (“Hughes”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,952,922 to Shober (“Shober”). (See 05/04/06 Office Action, p. 3, lines 5-6).

Amended claim 11 recites, a “radio system, comprising: a plurality of spatially separate radio units identifiable by a set of radio unit identifications; an interrogating station in communication with the plurality of radio units; a central station in communication with the

Attorney Docket No.: B 034372US

interrogating station; a transponding station identifiable by a transponding station identification, the transponding station in communication with both the interrogating station and the plurality of radio units; wherein, when said central station is required to determine a location of said transponding station, said central station transmits an enquiry signal to said interrogating station, said enquiry signal including said transponding station identification; and wherein said interrogating station rebroadcasts the enquiry signal to said transponding station and transmits individual wake-up messages to said radio units, each wake-up message including a corresponding radio unit identification."

Hughes generally relates to a system for tracking and analyzing physical objects, wherein a transponder is attached to each object and the transponders are interrogated periodically by a transmitter. (See Hughes, Abstract). Specifically, Hughes describes a system having a central processor connected to a central transmitter base station and a delay calculation processor linked to at least three pair of locating receivers. (See Id., col. 4, lines 11-18). The central transmitter may communicate with the transponders using radio frequency ("RF") signals, and the transponders may also communicate with the locating receivers using RF signals. (See Id., col. 4, lines 23-27). A unique identification number is used to allow the central processor to uniquely identify each transponder wherein active transponders may be contacted regularly to determine their position within a surveillance area. (See Id., col. 6, lines 13-27).

The Examiner correctly acknowledges the fact that the Hughes disclosure is silent with respect to an interrogating station as recited in the claims of the present invention. (See 05/04/06 Office Action, p. 4, lines 3-4). According to claim 11 of the present invention, the function of the interrogating station is to, *inter alia*, "rebroadcast[s] the enquiry signal to said transponding station and transmit[s] individual wake-up messages to said radio units..."

Attorney Docket No.: B 034372US

However, the Examiner erroneously claims that these functions are disclosed in Figs. 1 and 12b of Hughes. (See Id., p. 3, line 21 – p. 4, line 3). Specifically, the Examiner states that the computer of Hughes sends wake-up signals to the locating receivers. (See Id.). This is not the case. While the Hughes disclosure includes the use of a wake-up signal within the RF signal, it is important to note that the wake-up signal is only directed towards *the transponders*, which are in a sleep mode until receiving the wake-up signal. (See Id., col. 7, lines 9-58). Moreover, as conceded by the Examiner, the computer is analogized to the central station recited in the claims and not the interrogating station. Thus, there is no functionality disclosed in Hughes that relates to an interrogating station sending wake-up messages to radio units. Accordingly, Hughes fails to disclose or suggest the transmission of individual wake-up messages to radio units, wherein each wake-up message including a corresponding radio unit identification.

Shober generally relates to a radio communications system that can operate in several modes such as in-building security, location determination, messaging, and data communications. (See Shober, Abstract). Specifically, Shober describes a system that includes an application processor communicating with a plurality of interrogators over a local area network, wherein the interrogators communicate with one or more tags. (See Id., col. 3, lines 61-66). According to the Shober disclosure, the interrogators may receive an information signal from an applications processor, format the signal into a downlink message, and send to the one or more tags. (See Id., col. 3, line 66 – col. 4, line 3). The Examiner relies on the interrogator of Shober to anticipate the interrogating stations of the present invention. (See 05/04/06 Office Action, p. 4, lines 5-7). However, similar to the Hughes disclosure, Shober fails to disclose or suggest the function of the interrogating station, namely, the rebroadcasting of the enquiry signal to the transponding station and the transmitting of individual wake-up messages to the radio units

Attorney Docket No.: B 034372US

as recited in amended claim 11. Furthermore, Shober fails to disclose or suggest “an interrogating station *in communication with the plurality of radio units,*” as also recited in amended claim 11.

The present invention describes and claims a system including an interrogating station that receives messages from the radio units and relays messages to the central station. (See Specification, p. 5, line 28 – p. 6 line 1). In contrast to Hughes and Shober, the present invention describes a system including the interrogating station transmitting individual wake-up messages to corresponding radio units. (See Id., p. 8 line 23 – p. 9, line 5).

It is respectfully submitted that neither Hughes nor Shober teach or suggest “a plurality of spatially separate radio units identifiable by a set of radio unit identifications; an interrogating station *in communication with the plurality of radio units...* wherein said interrogating station rebroadcasts the enquiry signal to said transponding station and transmits individual wake-up messages to said radio units, each wake-up message including a corresponding radio unit identification,” as recited in claim 11.

Applicant respectfully submits that for at least the reasons stated above, claim 11 of the present application is not obvious over Hughes in view of Shober, and request that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn. As claims 12-18 depend from, and therefore include all the limitations of claim 11, it is hereby submitted that these claims are also allowable.

The Examiner rejected claim 19 using similar arguments to the rejection of claim 11 over Hughes in view of Shober. (See 05/04/06 Office Action, p. 3, line 7 – p. 4 line 12). However, amended claim 19 recites, a “method of operating a radio system including a plurality of spatially separate radio units, an interrogating station *in communication with the plurality of radio units,* a central station in communication with the interrogating station and a transponding

Attorney Docket No.: B 034372US

station in communication with both the interrogating station and the plurality of radio units, said method comprising... transmitting individual wake-up messages from the interrogating station to each radio unit, each wake-up message including a corresponding radio unit identification.” (Emphasis added). Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 19 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with regard to claim 11. As claims 20-26 depend from, and therefore include all the limitations of claim 19, it is hereby submitted that these claims are also allowable.

The Examiner rejected claim 27 using similar arguments to the rejection of claims 11 and 13 over Hughes in view of Shober. (See 05/04/06 Office Action, p. 7, lines 13-16). However, amended claim 27 recites, a “system including a plurality of spatially separate radio units, an interrogating station *in communication with the plurality of radio units...* a first radio unit comprising transceiver means for receiving a wake-up message from the interrogating station and a reply signal from said transponding station.” (Emphasis added). Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 27 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with regard to claim 11. As claim 28 depends from, and therefore includes all the limitations of claim 27, it is hereby submitted that claim 28 is also allowable.

Attorney Docket No.: B 034372US

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed. An early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Please direct all future correspondence to:

Larry Liberchuk, Esq.  
Senior IP Counsel

Philips Intellectual Property & Standards  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001  
Phone: (914) 333-9602  
Fax: (914) 332-0615  
Email: larry.liberchuk@philips.com

Respectfully submitted,

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Oleg F. Kaplun (Reg. No. 45,559)

Fay Kaplun & Marcis, LLP  
150 Broadway, Suite 702  
New York, NY 10038

Dated: August 2, 2006